

COLONIAL NEWSLETTER

P. O. Box 4411

Huntsville, Alabama 35815

J. C. Spilman, Editor

Volume 34, No. 1

February, 1994

Serial No. 96

MISCELLANEOUS RUMBLINGS, RAMBLINGS AND REPORTS FROM THE EDITOR.

SOME THINGS NEVER CHANGE!

The following comments are copied almost verbatim from the front page of CNL No. 50, published in November 1977 (page 605). Ye Editor has updated the words and phrases to fit the present time period, but other than an occasional inserted comment [in brackets] and the time shift the message remains the same. Please heed the message dear Patrons! It is **very** important! This may well be the final year for CNL unless there is a very great improvement in participation by our Patrons.

This is our first issue for 1994. It has been our objective in the past to produce a minimum of four issues per year, but in 1993 we mailed out only three issues. One factor was cost - it is considerably less expensive to make up and mail three larger issues than four smaller ones. More important, however, is the continuing shortage of material for publication, especially the shorter letters and articles. It has been a very difficult task to accumulate substantive material for each issue.

It is important that each of our Patrons recognize the fundamental purpose of CNL - and it will help, perhaps, if it is restated from time to time. [Like now!] CNL is designed as a means for communication between those of us interested in early American numismatics. It serves as a sounding board for questions, theories and opinions on the technical and humanistic aspects of early American coins and paper money.

All of the material published in CNL is submitted by our Patrons and must be in more or less complete form ready for final typing, including necessary photographs, charts, and whatever else is required. As most of our Patrons realize, CNL is a part-time endeavor of ye Editor and the mundane necessity to earn a living takes precedence over lower priority items. [Now retired but still very busy.] So - when we receive material intended for publication that requires extensive organization, editing and a search for photographs, it stands a very good chance for extensive delay in publication. One such article has been in-work for almost three years. [And we have another one of those today!] In other cases Patrons have decided - for various reasons - to pull back their material and to publish it elsewhere. So be it.

Another problem is correspondence. Time is often not available for extensive replies to personal questions and comment but even so ye Editor attempts to make a personal reply to every letter. [Still do.] Sometimes delays are necessary because correspondence must be set aside until time is available for reply.

The point of this message is to remind our Patrons that CNL is your opportunity to contribute and to receive knowledge of early American numismatics, and it requires your participation and assistance to be successful. You cannot leave everything to ye Editor. At the completion of each year ye Editor asks himself - is it worth the effort? From time to time your letters indicate an unseen harvest that makes it all worthwhile.

JCS

Sequential page 1407

ASK the EDITORS

To start with, in this issue, here is a new input regarding AE-8 from Kenneth Bressett of Colorado Springs, CO..

AE-8 Spanish Crowns with NE Countermarks

Information presented in the October issue on this subject is basically correct, but rather incomplete. I have searched for facts to confirm or deny these pieces for many years. The most likely conclusion is that all known specimens are modern concoctions made sometime between 1910 and 1950. There is, however, contradictory evidence that could yet prove them to be genuine, or at least the product of a much earlier period.

I have examined or seen photographs of eight specimens. One other has been reported. The countermark on each piece is from the same punch. It is round, not contoured like the 1652 coins. There is no reason to believe that an NE punch made in 1672 would necessarily be the same as that used 20 years earlier for a different purpose.

A more significant factor is that the known specimens are not all Spanish coins. Five are from Peru, two are from the Netherlands and one is from Spain. They are not all high grade specimens. Two are holed and one quite worn. Dates range from 1617 to 1673... or perhaps 1682 if the reported ninth specimen exists. I find that date questionable because the Boston Mint closed that year.

There seems to be no reason for the NE countermark to be attributed to any source other than the Massachusetts authorization. Nothing similar is recorded for any other country. The only NE pieces known to collectors are the New England silvers, and their many modern imitations. Most of those fakes try to copy the outlined

letters of the genuine pieces. The stamp used on the Noe-1 Pine Tree shilling that appeared in the Clay sale (1871) is an example of this.

A lengthy report with my findings about the NE countermarked pieces will soon be published. At that time it may even be feasible to speculate on which early American coin dealer was responsible for perpetrating this hoax. Until final conclusions are possible I for one will continue to regard these pieces as modern fakes, but will keep an open mind to the possibility of another judgement.

Ken's comments prompt ye Editor to raise another question regarding counterstamps.

AE-9 Ephraim Brasher's EB Counterstamp

Another counterstamp that has often piqued the curiosity of ye Editor is that of Ephraim Brasher. We are all familiar with the raised letters EB within an incuse oval that Brasher used on his New York doubloons. That counterstamp has been reported on as many as 36 specimens of foreign coins. (Brunk, *American and Canadian Countermarked Coins*, 1987, after Swoger). In addition, ye Editor recalls the sale of a group of a dozen or so EB counterstamped coins some ten years ago, or so, in a catalog sale but unfortunately is unable at present to locate the catalog. If memory serves several of those sale coins were in silver.

My questions deal with the authenticity of these various EB counterstamps. First, are all of the EB counterstamps on the Brasher Doubloons from the identical puncheon? Secondly, are the EB counterstamps on the foreign coins identical to that (or those) used on his Gold Doubloons. And thirdly, can anyone identify for ye Editor the sale catalog which he recalls from some years back? Many of the coins were plated in that catalog. **JCS**

Here is a new inquiry from
Chris Faulkner of Nepean,
Ontario, Canada

AE-10 GLEANINGS FROM THE QUEBEC GAZETTE

CNL Patrons might be interested in the following three items of news reported in the *Quebec Gazette* that have a particular application to the American Colonies:

Quebec Gazette, No. 51, June 6, 1765
(dateline London April 1, 1765):

Some thousand pounds sterling value, in silver threepenny pieces, are soon to be coined at the Mint, for the use of the American colonies, to supply the place of Copper Money, which the people there have long complained of.

Quebec Gazette, No. 114, March 9, 1767
(dateline London, October 24, 1766):

In a few days will begin to be struck at the Tower, Fifty Tons of Half-Pence, for the use of the City and Colony of New York.

Quebec Gazette, No. 125, May 21, 1767
(dateline London February 20, 1767):

It is said a scheme is under consideration for introducing the currency of English Bank Notes, not to exceed Five Pounds each, in the American colonies.

The *Quebec Gazette* was the first newspaper to be published in Quebec after the British conquest of New France. William Brown and Thomas Gilmore emigrated to the new English colony from Philadelphia in 1763 and put out the first four-page number of the *Gazette* to one hundred and forty-three subscribers at three dollars a year on June 21, 1764. The paper carried news of foreign affairs and local occurrences and also took on the job of printing official government announcements, ordinances and proclamations. As might be

expected, the *Gazette* has occasional items of interest on the state of the currency. Those remarks are especially interesting for the years immediately following 1764 through the period of the American Revolution, when there is no native coinage production on these shores and virtually the whole of Europeanized North America is British.

I cannot throw much light on the items quoted above. There were indeed threepenny pieces of George III struck for 1765, but interestingly they are far and away the rarest dates of the reign. No copper halfpennies of George III were struck until 1770. Whether British papers of the day might be more enlightening on these matters remains to be seen. Given the reluctance of the British crown to supply any of the colonies with specie, the suggestiveness of the above news reports seems all the more curious.

from Mike Hodder

Regarding Chris Faulkner's gleanings from the *Quebec Gazette*. I think these show that the press could get things wrong then, as now! Seriously, either that was the case, consistent misreporting; or else the stories were based on fact, perhaps proposed legislation or well-meaning intentions that were never carried out. **MJH**

Here is another new inquiry, this from Michael Oppenheim of Montreal, Canada

AE-11 Farthings in America

I would like to ask a question about the circulation and possible manufacture of farthings, particularly counterfeit George II and III farthings, in America before the introduction of federal currency. While I have come across a number of scattered pieces of evidence, I do not have much of an overall picture of this area.

Most books that I have seen on Colonial currency do not seem to directly address the question of the circulation of farthings. There is some information in the well-known article by Eric Newman on "American Circulation of English and Bungtown Halfpence." He cites (p. 143) a New York law of 1737 that begins, "Whereas for some years passed great quantities of English copper half pence and farthings have been from time to time imported into this colony." He refers (p. 144) to another N.Y. law of 1753, "An Act to Prevent the importing or passing Counterfeits of British Half-pence and Farthings." In 1749 a large amount of farthings of George II were part of a shipment to the Massachusetts Bay colony (p. 145). However, from my reading, none of the later references, in terms of laws or contemporary reports, speak about counterfeit farthings. Thus, it seems that regal and counterfeit George II farthings did pass in the colonies, but it is difficult to conclude anything about the circulation of authentic or counterfeit George III farthings, or about the possibility of American manufacture of counterfeit George II or III farthings.

Although I do not know much more than what Walter Breen wrote in *The Numismatist*, January 1952, I do not remember seeing reports of farthings as part of the hoards of early American coppers. In addition, I cannot recall references to farthings in the increasing research on American counterfeit halfpence. There are suggestions by Anton and Kesse, *The Forgotten Coins of the North American Colonies*, that some George III farthings might be of American origin (No. 100, 101, 103) but beyond statements about their crude style there is no justification presented for this view.

I know that there are many possible resources to explore, including: contemporary newspapers, diaries, merchants' lists of values of different circulating coins, etc.

I would appreciate any information that you can provide.

**from Mike Hodder,
once more**

Michael Oppenheim's query about counterfeit George II-III farthings circulating in the American colonies. This is both more difficult and more controversial than is Faulkner's question (AE-10). The 1753 New York legislature's act did specifically prohibit the import and circulation of counterfeit farthings. There are counterfeit farthings known in American and English collections. Beyond these (and a few other) facts not much else is settled. Eric Newman tends to think that farthings didn't really fit into the currency system here and any that got over to the Americas were probably rejected and sent packing back home. Mossman does not discuss the issue of whether farthings circulated to any significant degree. Breen's recollections of hoards containing farthings are unscientific and so unreliable. Anton and Kesse include farthings in their *The Forgotten Coins of the North American Colonies* but they give no historical evidence for doing so. Since almost every contemporary account of counterfeit coppers rails against the inequities of halfpence and fails to mention farthings at all tells me that the latter either didn't circulate much, or did so to a such a small extent as to be almost negligible. This is just my opinion, however, based on what I've read. We really need to study seriously what currency role, if any, farthings played in colonial times **MJH**

... and now a question
from Steven Chandler
of Mitchellville, MD

**AE-9 The Edges on the
Washington "Born Virginia"
tokens.**

Here is a question for the "Ask the Editors" column. I've recently put together a small

database on the Washington "Born Virginia" tokens, and have questions about some specific coins. The first question concerns lot 402 from the Roper Sale, a second inscription reverse style piece, in silver. I have seen references to this coin in auction catalogs which imply that this coin has a plain edge (Baker 60A) and other references to the same coin as lettered edge (Baker 60B). Which is it?

The second question concerns lot 1401 from Stack's September 1988 sale of the Herbert Oechsner collection, which was a Born Virginia with first inscription reverse style, in copper. This variety is referred to as Baker 60/59, but the catalog called it Baker 60, and listed it as having a plain edge. The Virgil Brand specimen of Baker 60/59 has made two auction appearances in the last several years, and has been catalogued both times with a lettered edge, and I have always assumed that all Baker 60/59s have lettered edges.

Can any of the editors or readers verify that Oechsner:1410 has a plain edge? Am I correct that the other specimens of Baker 60/59 all have lettered edges?

. . . from ye Editor

About the only comment that I can add here is that the Roper:402 catalog description states that the specimen has a plain edge and that the Oechsner:1410 catalog also specifically states that the specimen has a plain edge. **JCS**

. . . and from Mike Hodder

Regarding Steve Chandler's Ask the Editors questions - - I'll have to confess that I never really paid much attention to the edges of the Baker 60/59 or Baker 60 Washington Born Virginia's! I did remember to look at the edge of the silver Baker 60/59 in Stack's March, 1993 sale, it was ex Robison:263 and was lettered. Similarly, the copper Baker 60/59 in the same sale, lot 80, was also lettered (lot 81, a copper Baker 60, was plain edge). The

copper Baker 60 in Stack's December, 1993 sale was plain edge. I'm afraid I can't help with the edge types of Roper:402 or Oechsner:1410, I didn't see either of them. Maybe Steve is right and Baker 60/59 is the lettered edge kind while Baker 60 is the plain edge one. I sure hope so, it'd make cataloguing these a lot easier: the diagnostics are on the reverse but the reverse failed early and bulging on the medals usually obscures the places a cataloguer needs to see most! **MJH**

CNL New Book Review

Money of the American Colonies and Confederation: A Numismatic, Economic, & Historical Correlation, by Philip L. Mossman, M.D. New York: American Numismatic Society (Numismatic Studies 20), 1993. Long Quarto. [1-6], 7, [8], 9-314 pp. 30 Tables, 30 Charts, black and white illustrations. Red library buckram, gilt blind stamped, glossy color illustrated dust jacket.

CNL Patrons will be familiar with the broad outlines of Phil's book from the Preliminary Review Copy published here in September, 1986 (v.26, n.3, seq. p. 964) and the Addendum (February, 1988, v.28, n.1, seq. p. 1023). That said, Patrons will find a wealth of new information and recent research results in the new book that did not appear in the earlier redactions. In particular, the charts, tables, and illustrations incorporate data that are highly important and cannot be found elsewhere.

Phil begins his study with a review of the various coinages circulating in colonial and Confederation times. These are, in the main, thumbnail sketches and their outlines should be familiar to most Patrons. The heart of the book, in this reviewer's

opinion, is Chapter Eight, "The Coppers Panic of 1789". Phil's documentation here is both thorough and elegant and distills in one short chapter more than most of us have read in many years of research. It is the essential starting place for any subsequent analysis

Phil's methodology relies heavily upon metrological studies, making his book the first published on early American coins to take advantage of this technique. Metrology does not make for easy reading and this isn't a book to take away on a holiday for a light, collector-interest read. Instead, like all really useful books that will stand the test of time, it's one to keep on the shelf and return to time after time.

The bibliography is outstanding, comprehensive and very current. Nothing better has been printed before. The only problem I have with the book is the very steep retail price tag, \$100. The ANS clearly wants to break into the mass numismatic market with this book, but not at that price. **MJH**

Gary A. Trudgen's Review . . .

The wait is over for CNL patrons who were first introduced, back in 1986, to the ambitious undertaking of Philip L. Mossman, M.D. Issue No. 74 of *The Colonial Newsletter*, by far the largest ever, presented a "Preliminary Review Copy for CNL Patrons" of Dr. Mossman's studies. Many patrons responded with suggestions, which Phil incorporated as he continued to expand his study.

The fruit of Phil's many, many hours of hard work is now available in an impressive quarto-sized volume titled *Money of the American Colonies and Confederation: A Numismatic, Economic and Historical Correlation*. Published by the American Numismatic Society as Numismatic Studies No. 20, it is a must-have reference for every serious scholar of American numismatics. The book is profusely illustrated

and covered by a handsome dust jacket.

The focus of Phil's work is that the coins we collect and study today were once the medium of exchange of our ancestors. In this context, the use of money in America is traced from our beginnings to the establishment of the Federal mint in 1792. In my mind, the heart of the book is Chapter Eight. Here Phil presents his original research concerning the Coppers Panic of 1789, an area that has long merited comprehensive study. His study of the crisis and the conditions that precipitated it furnishes a solid foundation for future numismatic research in this era. Also, for numismatic researchers, several useful appendices are provided.

Congratulations to both Dr. Mossman and the ANS for providing us with an important new reference on early American numismatics.

GAT

. . . and now, a short review from Raymond H. Williamson of Lynchburg, VA. Ray is, in ye Editor's opinion, one of the real honest to goodness old time masters of early American numismatic research! At the request of ANS, Ray performed one of several peer reviews of Dr. Mossman's manuscript prior to publication. I recall that at the time Ray mentioned to me something to the effect that Phil's book would likely become the standard reference for many years to come, on the broad subject of early American numismatics.

Money of the American Colonies and Confederation: A Numismatic, Economic, & Historical Correlation, by Philip L. Mossman, M.D. New York: American Numismatic Society (Numismatic Studies 20), 1993.

Dr. Mossman has documented a scholarly review of pre-Federal copper coins. But there is much more. Please again consider

the last phrase of this long book title: A Numismatic, Economic, & Historical Correlation. These words really disclose the flavor of this monumental effort. Also, His "Bibliography" is by far the most comprehensive ever published in this field.

The high spot in the book is Chapter 8: "The Coppers Panic of 1789." The research back of this Chapter considers in depth the weight distributions of the various American copper coins of the Confederation period, and the conclusions which can be drawn from their study. The author brings to this book the analytical mind of the well-trained medical man, which will make it a much-consulted reference volume, but not one for easy reading. In his Appendix 4, "Weight Distribution of Confederation Coppers," he frequently uses the statistical expression "first standard deviation." I couldn't find this term in my college math books of the 1920's, but it has been around for several decades since then.

His universal use of "grains" instead of "grams" is appropriate, since all the source documents used "grains." Of course, twenty-first century users of this book, of which there will be many, may require conversion to "grams" in the then-metric world.

This ANS publication has been superbly printed, illustrated and bound — in Belgium. The \$100 retail price seems to require rather deep-pocketed buyers, but this outstanding volume is well worth the delayed acquisition of a couple of pre-Federal coppers. This reviewer is trying (with some success) not to judge 1994 prices by the cost of one of his own earliest numismatic acquisitions (1918) from B. Max Mehl: 100 U. S. copper cents, VG or better back to 1802, for \$5.00 postpaid.

RHW

. . . from ye Editor

Back in September of 1986 when we published the Preliminary Review Copy of Phil's book as CNL No. 74, it was accompa-

nied by a copy of our "Editor's Notebook" supplement containing the following explanation :

Phil Mossman's Notebook

The attached issue No. 74 of CNL, one of our "Data Book" series, is a preliminary and experimental research document — a new departure in numismatic publishing in that it probably represents the first time that an entire book has been submitted to the total membership of an organization for review prior to formal publication. The work presented at this time represents some eight years of effort by Philip L. Mossman, MD of Hampden, Maine which began as a compilation of a personal notebook on the Early American Coinages, and then evolved into the present format. It is not yet complete; because of the complexity of the subject matter and the difficulties in locating and evaluating specific up-to-date research documentation on various Early American numismatic subjects, we have decided to publish the volume at the present time with the specific request that each of our Patrons read and study the particular portions in which he or she feels proficient and advise ye Editor of changes, corrections, deletions, expansions and references which should be incorporated as necessary to update the overall subject matter.

We anticipate conducting a running forum of commentary in future issues of CNL which will include comments received from our Patrons regarding the material in Dr. Mossman's book together with his response to these inputs. Those wishing to contact Dr. Mossman directly may write to him in care of CNL and your inquiries will be forwarded to him.

The book is a framework for the presentation and correlation — as the title indicates — of the numismatic, economic and historical aspects of the money of the American colonies and the Confederation. Emphasis is on the metallic currency of the

era; however the paper currency is also treated briefly and should probably be expanded in scope. Dr. Mossman has attempted to take today's precious numismatic artifacts out of dealer's trays and collector's cabinets and put them back into the pockets of their contemporaries — as money — and as a reflection of the economic needs and frustrations of people of that era.

The heart of the book comprises Chapters 7 and 8 on the Confederation Coinages (which is merely a general overview) and The Coppers Panic of 1789, respectively. Other chapters are support material which describe the circumstances preceding the Confederation period and the consequences thereof. To the casual reader we suggest that these two chapters, plus the preface, would be a suitable area for initial reading. Of particular significance, we believe, is Dr. Mossman's discussion and analysis in Chapter 8 (and Appendix II) of the financial advantages accruing to the mint operators from the practice of overstriking existing coins.

At the present time our intent is that we will eventually produce a revised edition, possibly in a hardback version, which incorporates the suggestions and comments of CNL Patrons. We anticipate that there will be an extensive revision. There are areas which are incomplete, and in some cases incorrect since they do not reflect up-to-date research. There are probably other topics which have not even been mentioned and should be included for completeness. While the present material has undergone an initial review over the years by several CNL Patrons, including ye Editor, most of us (including the author) recognize the comprehensive scope of this volume and that none of us are proficient in all aspects that are organized within this framework; accordingly, it seems reasonable to publish this preliminary version for the use of CNL Patrons and to request the assistance of all of you in debugging it. Much of the charted information now in

tabular form can be converted into graphical format but has, for now, been left in tabular format so that specific items can be checked for accuracy.

One CNL Patron has suggested that, today, " ... the study of American colonial era coinages and economic history is going through the initial stages of a renaissance, and our work will be seen by future students as some of the first steps taken toward a more solid understanding of the field." Years ago when ye Editor first became interested in the monies of Early America he quickly determined that there was only one general reference available that had stood the test of time, and that was Sylvester Sage Crosby's monumental work "The Early Coins of America; and ... (etc)". Subsequently he determined that a considerable amount of later work had been accomplished, but that it was extremely fragmented and difficult to locate, and while much of it was well thought out and documented, an equal amount seemed to have been accomplished in a vacuum and consisted of speculation, misinformation, and hypothesis passed off as scholarship in the Early American field; problems which remain vexatious today, even to those of us proficient in a specialty area.

As Dr. Mossman collected and organized the material for his book he conducted an extensive literature search and, in so doing, encountered the problems outlined in the paragraph above. In the Preface he states " ... I have intended to remain conservative, but no doubt have been guilty of perpetuating traditional inaccuracies or inventing some of my own." It is in this spirit that we recognize several shortcomings in the present version, and we specifically mention two of them now: (1) the material on Massachusetts silver is based heavily on the studies by Noe and does not incorporate more recent studies which have shown that Noe was inaccurate on many points; accordingly, many of the conclusions in this particular section must be substantially revised even though they rep-

resent the "state-of-the-art" in numismatic research at a somewhat earlier time, and (2) the section on Saint Patrick's coinages is outdated for similar reasons and, unfortunately - we believe, includes considerable "entrenched conjecture" which more recent studies in England have shown to be inaccurate. This section will also be extensively revised in the future edition.

Why then, our Patrons may ask, has this material been included — why was it not omitted or adequately revised prior to publication? The answer is a bit complex, but in summary is both simple and direct: Revisions can go on and on and nothing may be accomplished as a result; ye Editor believes that Dr. Mossman's work is important and should be presented to the Patrons of The Colonial Newsletter Foundation in Data Book form for their collective review and critique, and we have done so. We believe that our Patrons are individually and collectively much more than casual numismatists and will be willing to assist in a systematic, scholarly and constructive review of the material collected in Dr. Mossman's notebook. So — lets get on with it!

JCS

Well, we did - - and you did - - and with the assistance of the American Numismatic Society (ANS) **Phil Mossman's Notebook** became what we have today. Many thanks to each and everyone of you. Now - - lets all work toward continued future progress in the form of a "third" edition, perhaps a paperback priced at something around \$29.95, so that there can be a copy "for the rest of us!"

JCS

The Research Forum

RF-65 Maris' New Jersey Book Puzzle

In 1881 Edward Maris, MD published his thin but monumental book "A Historic Sketch of the Coins of New Jersey, with a plate, and etc." His book of only 17 pages, plus the plate, was printed by William K. Bellows of Philadelphia. The large photographic plate was a masterpiece for its time.

There are two anomalies in the text of "Maris" that have puzzled me for several years. The first appears on page 13 in the discussion following variety 48-g "... Having met with a new reverse and a new obverse belonging to the coulterless group, since that part of this work which describes it was printed, they will now be noticed." The second appears three pages later following the main text on page 16. This is a group of corrections for pages 5, 8 and 10.

The obvious question that arises is with regard to the nature of the printing techniques. It seems unusual to me that a book consisting of only 17 pages would be printed in sections over a period of time. Were pages printed individually, or what? Perhaps one of our Patrons can throw some light on these questions. An examination of the binding and signature construction of an original copy may provide some answers, or at least some clues, to this puzzlement.

RF-66 Hessian Payments

Does anyone know in what funds the Hessian mercenaries were paid? Was English currency or German currency used? Especially in the Pennsylvania "Dutch" i.e. German areas?

The New Jersey No Coulter Die Families

by
Michael Hodder

INTRODUCTION

The No Coulter varieties are among the rarest and most avidly collected of all New Jersey coppers. When Maris catalogued the series in 1881 he included eleven die combinations: 7-E, 8-F, 9-G, 10-G, 10-h, 11-G, 11-H, 11 1/2-G, 12-G, 12-I, and 22-P. In laying out his photographic plate he grouped all but the last of these together in the upper right quadrant, apparently based upon their obverse style, which is similar. He placed 22-P in the lower left of the plate, although in the text he noted that its obverse resembled 10 in many respects. This anomalous placement may have been made necessary in order to accommodate the photographic layout of the obverses 21-24 marriages. In the years following publication of Maris' catalogue several new combinations and dies were discovered, including 7-C, 8 1/2-C, 10-gg, 10-oo, 10 1/2-C, and 11-hh, making a grand total of 17 different varieties. Only three of these are collectable, 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I; the rest are rare to unique. Maris 7-C, 7-E, and 8-F are the famous Date Under Plowbeam varieties and constitute a sub-group of the No Coulter series.

Despite their obvious design difference, however, the No Coulter varieties have never been studied in depth. This is explainable, perhaps, by their rarity, since gathering together a representative number of specimens of each variety can be a near to impossible task. Over the past several years I have been privileged to study many important, comprehensive collections of New Jersey coppers and have compiled a database of observations that might allow such a detailed study.

THE FOUR NO COULTER FAMILIES

Among the No Coulter varieties there are four immediate die family groups. In my usage, an immediate family is composed only of those dies directly linked together and does not extend beyond the first generation or include marriages to obverses with coulter.

Table 1. The Immediate No Coulter Families

Group I	Group II	Group III
E-7-C-8 1/2 \ 10 1/2	8-F	hh \ H-11 h oo \< \< / 9-G-10-gg / I-12 11 1/2
	Group IV	
	22-P	

Two of the immediate family groups, II and IV, are singletons, two dies each known in only one die combination. Group I is composed of five members in four die marriages. Group III is the largest and most complex, including 12 members in 10 die combinations.

If we expand the family groups to include collateral members that are not No Coulter dies but are related through second generation and later obverse or reverse marriages, we find the following extended families:

Table 2. The Extended No Coulter Families

Group I	Group II	Group III
<div>3, 4, 5 6-D \ / E-7-C-8 1/2 \ 10 1/2</div>	8-F	As above, now interlocked through 12-I to 24-I, through 24 to M, P, Q, R, thence to 41 other obverses and 29 reverses (13-J to 51-g), and to No Coulter Group IV.
	<div>Group IV 21 22 \ / P / \ 23 24</div>	
	Also interlocked through 24-P to 24-I, through 24-I and R, 20 and 21-N to No Coulter Group III and the same extended family.	

Group I now includes the rare and enigmatic obverses 3, 4, and 5, as well as the common varieties 6-C and 6-D and so has expanded to include 10 members in nine combinations.

Group II remains unchanged as a singleton family. Neither Group I nor II has extended relationships to the other two No Coulter groups, nor to any other dies in the New Jersey series and both are still isolated from the main body of the coinage. Groups III and IV, on the other hand, have undergone the most change and are now seen interlocked not only with the majority of the small planchet New Jersey varieties, but also with each other through many combinations.

METROLOGY OF THE NO COULTER FAMILIES

Insufficient data exists to analyze the metrology of Group II. The two specimens sold in the last twelve years, Garrett:1393 and Roper:299, have weights recorded as 116.8 and 125.8 grains, respectively. Unfortunately, neither diameter nor reverse axis data were included by the cataloguers. Sufficient data do exist for Groups I, III, and IV, however. In the case of the first group, this analysis will examine data for the extended family. This includes 6-C, 6-D, 7-C, 7-E, 8 1/2-C, and 10 1/2-C. The anomalous 3-C, 4-C, and 5-C combinations have been omitted since their obverse types are not part of the regular New Jersey coinage series. In the case of Group III, the analysis will include the immediate family members, only, 9-G, 10-h, 10-gg, 10-oo, 11-G, 11-H, 11-hh, 11 1/2-G, 12-G, and 12-I. The extended family related through obverse 24 is simply too large to make any observations meaningful. The analysis of Group IV includes the immediate family 22-P and its direct relatives 21-P, 23-P, and 24-P, but not the extended family composed of the majority of the small planchet New Jersey varieties.

Planchet weights

Group I coins are found on planchets ranging from 110.8-158.8 grains in weight. For individual varieties within this family the statistics are as follows:

Table 3. Group I Metrology

	6-C	6-D	7-C
Mean:	139.0	140.5	No data
Median:	140.7	140.6	
STDS:	7.5	7.4	
N =	31	52	
	7-E	8 1/2-C	10 1/2-C
Mean:	142.0	131.4	Unique
Median:	150.0	—	
STDS:	17.3	—	
N =	3	2	

Data is scarce or non-existent for all but two varieties in Group I. This is explained simply, by the rarity of most No Coulter combinations. Maris 7-C and 10 1/2-C are both unique, while 8 1/2-C is R-8 and 7-E is R-7+. There are simply too few surviving coins of these varieties for any kind of meaningful analysis. The metrology of Group I will, therefore, be only a reflection of the metrologies of 6-C and 6-D. Those two varieties, struck over some indeterminate duration, show a remarkable similarity in their means, while their median weights (i.e., the weight of the specimen exactly in the middle of the range lowest-highest weight) are also nearly identical. Since the statutory requirement for New Jersey coppers was 155 grains, it is plain that these varieties were, on average, considerably underweight. Their low first standard deviations (STDS = sample standard deviation) are nearly equal. It should be clear that both were the product of the same minting facility and their similarities suggest that the mint successfully made an effort to maintain a single, if low, weight standard during the lives of these two combinations.

Table 4. Group III Metrology

	9-G	10-G	10-h	10-gg	10-oo
Mean:	142.3	132.5	131.5	134.5	Unique
Median:	148.8	133.7	133.3	—	
STDS:	12.9	8.9	5.4	—	
N =	5	9	5	2	
	11-H	11-hh 11	1/2-G	12-G	12-I
Mean:	146.7	Unique	134.1	140.2	150.3
Median:	145.1		134.8	140.6	153.5
STDS:	6.5		5.1	10.0	11.8
N =	12		6	24	19

Group II is composed of Maris 8-F only. This variety is R-8. The weights of two specimens have been published and they yield a mean of 121.3 grains. However, the sample size is too small for any kind of useful analysis.

Group III coins range in weight from 117.3-169.1 grains. The statistics for the individual members of this family are given in Table 4, above (previous page).

Again, given the rarity of the No Coulter varieties as a whole, data for all but two combinations in this family are limited. With this proviso in mind, then, it appears that some Group III coins were slightly heavier than those in Group I while others were not. Maris 9-G, 11-H, and 12-I fall into the former category. The weights of the obverse 10 combinations and 11 1/2-G and 12-G are more similar to those of Group I members. Significantly, the first standard deviations also show a similar division in this group. The STDS of 9-G and 12-I are higher than Group I's, while the figures for the other varieties in the group are quite similar to those found in Group I. Applied to the means of four members (9-G, 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I) they show that some specimens of these varieties either closely approached or actually exceeded the statutory weight requirement for New Jersey coppers. This is quite unlike the coins in Group I. They also show a less successful attempt at maintaining a single weight standard. Three members, 10-G, 10-h, 11 1/2-G (and possibly a fourth, 10-gg), show overall metrological characteristics more akin to those of Group I than the other relatives of Group III.

Weights for Group IV coins range from 120.1-173.6 grains. Individual varieties' statistics are as follows:

Table 5. Group IV Metrology

	21-P	22-P	23-P	24-P
Mean:	145.0	134.0	147.3	148.2
Median:	143.3	136.9	148.0	148.5
STDS:	9.4	11.1	9.0	11.7
N =	21	5	28	35

In terms of both mean weights and first standard deviations 21-P, 23-P, and 24-P resemble 9-G, 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I in Group III. Maris 22-P's mean weight resembles Group I and 10-G, 10-h, and 11 1/2-G of Group III more than its Group IV relatives, but its STDS is considerably higher. For the majority of Group IV members, mean weights are generally higher, as are first standard deviations. There is clearly more dispersal around the mean in this group than in I and, as seen in III, this suggests more difficulty with maintaining a single weight standard for the coiners of Groups III and IV than those of I.

Diameters

Group I coins are found on flans ranging from 28.0 to 31.0 mm. Within Group I we find the diameters of 7-E and 10 1/2-C, along with the late state of obverse 6 (almost exclusively 6-D) ranging from 28.0 to 29.5. The early and intermediate states of obverse 6 (6-C and some 6-D) are found on larger, 29.6 to 31.0 mm flans. Maris 6-C was struck in quantity first, on large diameter flans. Midway in the life of obverse 6 the die began rusting, and at that time it was also married to reverse D. In the later stages of its life obverse 6 was used most frequently with reverse D and was struck on smaller diameter flans than previously. The life history of obverse 6, therefore, shows a clear progression over time towards smaller flans typical of Rahway's production. If this is a true reflection of chronological duration, then it is very probable that the No Coulter varieties in Group I were struck after the majority of 6-C and many 6-D had been coined.

Group III coins are found on flans ranging from 28.0-29.5 mm with one exception. This includes some examples (but not all) of the rarely seen late state of 11-H, which come on 29.6-31.0 mm planchets, like the early and intermediate state obverse 6 family. The early state of 11-H and other examples of the later state are found on typical Group III flans.

The early states of Group IV varieties 21-P, 23-P, and 24-P varieties are seen on much smaller planchet stock, with diameters under 27.9 mm. In their later states, they are found on larger, 28.0-29.5 mm flans, like Groups I and III. The sole No Coulter combination in Group IV, 22-P, is always found on this size flan.

Die sizes

Coins struck off center occasionally show the outline of the edge of one (sometimes both) the dies that struck them. If the coin is markedly off center and shows at least 30 % of the arc of the whole die edge, then we can complete the arc's circle and estimate the actual size of the die that struck that particular coin. Such measurements are only approximations but if several can be made the approximation will begin to approach the real size of the die. Some varieties among the No Coulter families are never found off center, while others, particularly 6-C and 6-D, are frequently seen struck from mis-aligned dies. The data that follow are necessarily tentative. Where one die is seen to be located in several different columns the obvious conclusion is that such observations are still limited in number and therefore still imprecise. Each entry below represents measurements from at least two specimens. In the case of obverse 6 and reverse C, measurements were taken from more than 20 different coins.

Table 6. Groups 1-IV Die Sizes

	>26<27mm	>27<28mm	>28<29mm	>29mm
Group I		Obv. 7	Rev. C Obv. 6	Obv. 6
Group III		Obv. 10 Obv. 11 Obv. 12 Rev. G Rev. gg	Obv. 10 Rev. G	
Group IV	Obv. 21 Obv. 24	Obv. 21 Obv. 23 Obv. 24 Rev. P	Obv. 21 Obv. 22 Obv. 23 Obv. 24 Rev. P	

It appears that Group I dies were somewhat larger than almost all of those used for Groups III and IV. Obverses 21 and 24 may have been the smallest of all dies used on members of the extended No Coulter families, but the spread of the observations shows that their actual diameters were probably very similar to those of most other Group III members. Obverse 22, the only No Coulter die in Group IV, appears to have been larger than its collateral members and approached the size of the dies used for Group I coins. With these exceptions in mind, it nevertheless appears that the dies used for Groups III and IV were very similar in size.

Reverse die orientations

The No Coulter die combinations in Group I were all struck with their reverses aligned medal turn (i.e., broadly around the compass from 270°-90°). Varieties 6-C and 6-D of the extended family, on the other hand, were all coined with their reverses aligned coin turn (i.e., 90°-270°).

The varieties in Group III were struck with their reverses aligned both coin and medal turn. The majority of specimens seen of 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I are found aligned medal turn, together with all 9-G, 10-G, and 10-oo. Only two specimens of 11-H and one each of 12-G and 12-I are presently known aligned coin turn on their reverses. Unfortunately, these exceptions are from the same die states as the majority of their varieties seen, so there appears to be no change observable over time. Maris 10-h, gg, 11-hh, and 11 1/2-G, on the other hand, are found aligned coin turn.

Group IV coins were all struck aligned coin turn without exception. This holds also for the sole No Coulter variety in the group, 22-P.

Die emission sequences

Reverse C rusted late in its life, but since it was in its perfect state when 7-C, 8 1/2-C and 10 1/2-C were struck and since most 6-C seen are also in the perfect reverse state, it is impossible to place the No Coulter dies into the obverse 6 time line based upon die state evidence save at the very beginning. No useful emission sequence can be proposed for the dies in Group I.

No emission sequence is necessary for Group II, since only one die combination is found here and neither die is linked to any other New Jersey variety.

Reverse G, the linchpin die in Group III, remained in a perfect state throughout its life and so cannot be used to establish a unified emission sequence for this family. Obverse 10 failed over time. Based upon limited observations, due to the rarity of all combinations with this obverse, its sequence appears to be 10-G and 10-oo, followed by 10-h and 10-gg, ending with an additional quantity of 10-h. Obverse 11 developed a break under the date and its emission sequence appears to be 11-H and all 11-hh, followed by an additional quantity of 11-H. Similarly, obverse 12 failed over time and its general emission sequence is 12-I, followed by 12-G.

In Group IV, reverse P developed a break at the rim over the first star and E in the legend. Its emission sequence is 21-P, 23-P, 24-P struck in the perfect state, followed by additional quantities of these three combinations and 22-P in the broken reverse state.

Die engraving styles

All groups are unified by the lack of a coulter in the obverse plow design. Groups I, II, and III all bear their dates in microscopically small numbers with the exception of obverse 6 in Group I. The sole No Coulter obverse in Group IV, Maris 22, also has a small date. Other Group IV dates are large, like that of obverse 6. Groups I and II are further united by the presence of the Date Under Plowbeam varieties.

Group I, III, and IV obverses have thin plow handles, while obverse 7 of Group I and Group II's sole obverse 8 have thicker handles. The horse's head is small on obverses from Groups I, II, and III (10 only), large on Group IV dies and all other obverses of Group III. With the sole exception of obverse 24 from Group IV, all other obverses in Groups I-IV have shaggy maned horses' heads. Obverse 24's mane is cropped.

The reverse shields on Group I and II dies are broad, as are the shields on reverses G and gg of Group III. Group IV reverses and the remaining Group III dies all have small to medium sized shields.

For the purposes of analysis I call those varieties with small heads and large shields Style One, those with large heads and small shields Style Two.

ANALYSIS OF THE NO COULTER FAMILIES

The No Coulter varieties in Group I are found on light weight, medium sized flans. None reached the statutory 155 grains weight called for in the coinage contract of 1786. Their reverse axes are medal turn. Their 1786 date numerals and horse's heads are small and their reverse shields are large (Style One). Two of the four have their dates placed below their plowbeams. Maris 6-C and 6-D, on the other hand, while also on light weight flans, show a progression over time from large to medium sized flans and have their reverses aligned coin turn. The obverse 6 and reverse C dies also seem to have been larger than the others in this group. The emission sequence established for obverse 6 cannot help in placing the No Coulter obverse married to this die into a time line. It is probable, however, that the No Coulters in this group were struck after the early state 6-C's. It is possible, but less likely, that both large and small diameter planchet stock was available at the same time. In addition, obverse 6's date numerals are large and the date, itself, is 1787.

The sole member of Group II, Maris 8-F, cannot be analyzed metrologically due to its extreme rarity. The two recorded specimens, however, show weights considerably below those called for by law and ones that resemble the weights of Group I coins. In terms of style Maris 8-F also resembles the other date under plowbeam varieties found in Group I.

Group III varieties are more complex and divided than those in Group I. The weights of 10-G, 10-h, 11 1/2-G, and possibly 10-gg resemble those of Group I. By contrast, the weights of 9-G, 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I are more robust and the populations of these varieties originally included many coins that reached or exceeded the statutory norm for the New Jersey coinage. Planchet sizes are generally medium, with the exception of some 11-H in their late states, which are as large as those seen on some Maris 6-C of Group I. Other late state 11-H are found on medium sized flans, so it is clear that at the time this variety was struck the coiners had access to both large and medium sized planchet stocks. The sketchy data for die sizes available suggests that obverse 10 and reverse G may have been larger than the others, resembling the sizes of obverse 6 and reverse C in Group I. In terms of reverse die orientations a similar split can be seen in this group. Three varieties, 9-G, 10-G, and 10-oo are always found aligned medal turn, like the No Coulter coins of Group I. Four others, 10-h, 10-gg, 11-hh, and 11 1/2-G, are always found aligned coin turn. Maris 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I are found in both alignments in the same die states but the majority are medal turn. The emission sequence established for obverse 10 shows that over time the alignment of 10-G, 10-h, 10-gg, and 10-oo changed from medal to coin turn. Group III is also divided stylistically. Obverse 10 and reverses G and gg resemble the dies of Groups I and II; the rest of the varieties have larger horse's heads and medium to smaller reverse shields.

Finally, Group IV also shows several clear divisions among its members. The weights of the varieties with coulters (Maris 21-P, 23-P, and 24-P) are as robust as those seen on 9-G, 11-H, 12-G, and 12-I of Group III. On the other hand, the weights of the single No Coulter variety in this group, 22-P, resemble those of Groups I, II, and the light weight varieties of Group III (10-G, 10-h, 11 1/2-G, and possibly 10-hh). Planchet sizes show a clear progression from the smallest

of any group analyzed to the medium size typical of most No Coulters. Two different planchet stocks were available to the coiners of this group and over time they changed from small to medium flans. It is important to note, however, that the sole No Coulter variety in this group, 22-P, always comes on medium flans. Limited data regarding die sizes suggest that obverse 22 may have been larger than the others, but at this stage it is inconclusive. Group IV coins are always found with their reverse aligned coin turn, like some Group III No Coulters and the two with coulter varieties in Group I. Stylistically, Group IV coins resemble those of Group III more than Groups I and II. The No Coulter member of this group, however, shares the small date numeral style seen on all No Coulters and this also sets it apart from the other members of this group. Maris 22-P, although it shares a reverse, is very dissimilar in terms of weight, planchet size, and possibly also obverse die size, to the other dies married to reverse P.

All No Coulter obverses are dated 1786 in small numerals. All are struck on medium sized flans. These are the only factors that unify all four groups of die families, however. In all other respects there are nearly as many dissimilarities as there are parametrical relationships. Expressed schematically, the above observations of the No Coulter die families may be shown as follows:

Table 7. Groups I-IV Immediate Families
Analytical Comparisons

Style One	Style Two	Low Weight	Heavy Weight	Medal Turn	Coin Turn
Group I		Group I		Group I	
Group II		Group II		—	—
	9-G		9-G	9-G	
10-G		10-G		10-G	
	10-h	10-h			10-h
10-gg		10-gg			10-gg
	10-oo	10-oo		10-oo	
	11-H		11-H	11-H (most)	11-H (few)
	11-hh		11-hh		11-hh
	11 1/2-G	11 1/2-G			11 1/2-G
	12-G		12-G	12-G (most)	12-G (few)
	12-I		12-I	12-I (most)	12-I (few)
	22-P	22-P			22-P

CONCLUSIONS

The immediate No Coulter families in Groups I and II are remarkably homogeneous. In terms of metrology and style their varieties are very similar. They are further linked by the presence of the Date Under Plowbeam varieties, which are found in no other group. When the extended members 6-C and 6-D are added to Group I the metrology hardly changes at all, although a new stylistic factor is found. More importantly, this addition of a key reverse die introduces a new, larger planchet diameter into the family. Although the emission sequence for reverse C cannot be established, there is certain evidence that the coiners using that reverse changed from large to medium diameter flans over the life of obverse 6 to which it was married. Since the No Coulter families in Group I all appear on medium diameter flans, there is suggestive evidence here that they were struck after the earliest state of the obverse 6 family.

Maris 6-C has long been held to have been struck by Walter Mould at Morristown. This belief was supported by the similarity of planchet size between 6-C and those varieties found in the fabric of Solitude, where Mould's mint was located. However, we have seen that whoever struck 6-C ceased using large diameter planchet stock approximately one-third of the way along in obverse 6's life. We also know that Maris 64-t, traditionally attributed to Mould, is found on both large and medium diameter flans. If 64-t and 6-C are correctly attributed to Mould, then we are faced with the conclusion that at some point in his operations he had access to planchet stock of a size typical of Rahway's operation, but that the quantity was limited since only two varieties attributed to him are found on medium diameter flans. Whether this access occurred early or late in his operation is as yet unknown.

If Maris 6-C is correctly attributed to Mould, then we also find that Group I of the No Coulter families is intimately connected to one of the Morristown Mint's products. Further, the presence of the two Date Under Plowbeam varieties in Group I links it to Group II, and the interesting suggestion arises that perhaps Maris 8-F, indeed, all the Date Under Plowbeam varieties, may have been products of Walter Mould's mint.

Group III is extremely complex. Some of its members share metrologies, die axes, and die diameters with those of Group I, while others are quite unlike Group I families. The obverse 10 marriages are generally more akin to Group I and II varieties than they are to the other members of Group III. On the other hand, the obverse 11 and 12 marriages are unlike those in Groups I or II, and are also significantly different from the obverse 10 varieties in Group III.

Group IV's sole No Coulter marriage, Maris 22-P, is metrologically similar to the Group I and II families in some respects, but resembles the Group III obverse 11 and 12 marriages in others. In terms of planchet diameters, we have seen that Group IV marriages were first struck on small flans. As time went on, planchet diameters increased in size to that found on all Group III and most Groups I and II coins. The increase occurred before Maris 22-P was first struck.

Taken all together, it appears that the No Coulter families are not a single block of die marriages all struck in the same minting facility. Group I shows a change from large to medium diameters, while Group IV alters from small to medium flans, for example. Groups I and II are closely linked to Mould's mint but have no extensions through other marriages to any other New Jersey variety. Groups III and IV, however, are interlocked through later generations of die marriages to the majority of the medium planchet varieties usually attributed to Rahway, but to none of those attributed to Morristown.

Thus, it appears that the omission of a coulter from the plough design on the obverses of some New Jersey varieties does not signify something particular to one mint which is now obscure in its meaning. Rather, it is probable that both Mould and the Goadsby-Cox partnership omitted the coulter simultaneously and for the same reason. The similarity in style among all the No Coulter dies, particularly the choice of microscopic date numerals and shaggy horse's manes, does suggest a common hand on the dies. Perhaps the New Jersey Supreme Court forwarded designs for the coinage that did not include a coulter on the plough. However, we do not know if the No Coulter varieties were struck early in the coinage contract, or later in 1787 or even 1788. Some mysteries about New Jersey's coins yield to this sort of analysis. Others may never be solved.

